

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
Application No.: 10/785,481

Attorney Docket No.: Q80099

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

Applicant submits herewith one Replacement Drawing Sheet containing replacement drawing Figure 5.

Attachment: 1 Replacement Sheet(s)

REMARKS

Claims 1-12 are all the claims pending in the application. Claims 1, 5, and 9 have been amended for clarity. These amendments are fully supported by the specification as originally filed and in particular pages 13-18. As such, Applicant respectfully requests the entry of these amendments and consideration of the following remarks.

I. Formalities

Applicant thanks the Examiner for acknowledging Applicant's claim for foreign priority. However, Applicant notes the Examiner failed to confirm receipt of the certified copy of the priority document. As such, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner do so in the next Office Action.

II. Drawing Objection

Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner withdraw the objections to the drawings in view of the self-explanatory amendments presented above.

III. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8-10, and 12

Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8-10, and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Silverbrook (US 5,984,446) in view of Goetz (US 4,978,971). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*,

(b) storing color image data for an area corresponding to a height of entire nozzles of the print head in the sub scanning direction that are used during each main scanning pass of color printing into a first buffer

In the Office Action, the Examiner asserted that Silverbrook teaches the above requirements of claim 1 at Column 24, Lines 63-65. However, Applicant respectfully submits that the teaching that "minimum practical size for a full width, full color head for printing A4

size paper is approximately 215mm × 5 mm” fails to teach or suggest the above recited claim feature. (Silverbrook, Col. 24, Lns 63-65). Further, Applicant respectfully submits that neither Silverbrook nor any of the other cited references teach or suggest at least “storing color image data for an area corresponding to a height of entire nozzles **of the print head** in the sub scanning direction that are used during **each main scanning pass** of color printing into a first buffer.”

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1 would not have been obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Silverbrook in view of Goetz, because the references, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest all of the features and limitations of the claims. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claim 1 and claims 2 and 4 at least by virtue of their dependency from claim 1.

Applicant further respectfully submits independent claims 5 and 9 are patentable over the cited combination for the same or similar reasons. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claims 5 and 9 and claims 6, 8, 10, and 12 at least by virtue of their dependency from claims 5 and 9.

Claims 3, 7, and 11

Claims 3, 7, and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Silverbrook et al (US 5,984,446) in view of Goetz et al (US 4,978,971) and further in view of Cheung et al (US 5,973,803). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Above, Applicant pointed out that Silverbrook in view of Goetz is deficient vis-à-vis independent claims 1, 5, and 9. Applicant respectfully submits that Cheung fails to compensate for the deficiencies of Silverbrook and Goetz. Even taken for what they would have meant as a whole to an artisan of ordinary skill, the combined teachings of these references would not have

(and could not have) led the artisan of ordinary skill to the subject matter of independent claims 1, 5, and 9, much less dependent claims 3, 7, and 11.

Therefore, claims 3, 7, and 11 would not have been obvious within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Additional, untaught modifications would have been necessary.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 3, 7, and 11.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

/Logan J. Brown 58,290/

Logan J. Brown

Registration No. 58,290

Date: January 23, 2008